

BOHEMIA AND THE SCOTTISH LOLLARDS

BY THE REV. T. M. A. MACNAB, B.D.

I

IN 1382 Richard II. of England married Princess Ann of Bohemia and naturally the event led to intercourse between the two countries. Six years later Adalbert Ranconis de Ericinio founded scholarships for Czech students at Paris and Oxford, and this brought the academic life of the two peoples into close contact. By this time the Lollard movement was in full swing in England. Though Wyclif had died in 1384 his teaching still continued, and Czech students at Oxford could hardly help being touched by it. One of the most noteworthy of these students was Jerome of Prague, who on his return to his own country took MSS. of several of Wyclif's works with him.

About the same time the influence of Wyclif's teaching began to be felt in Scotland, though by whom it was introduced is unknown. The Duke of Albany, who became regent on the death of his brother, Robert III, in 1406, won the admiration of the Church and its adherents because—

“ He wes a costanat Catholike ;
All Lollard he hatyt and heretike.”¹

By that time Lollardy was a recognised movement in the land, and its adherents were classed with heretics.² Much has been made by the late Principal Lindsay of the part played by Scottish students at Oxford in bringing Wyclif's doctrine north³—too much, it would seem, because an examination of the *Rotuli Scotiae*⁴ fails to give any name in the long list of Scottish students then at Oxford, to whom safe-conducts were granted, and whose standing and influence were comparable to those of Jerome in Bohemia.

¹ Wyntoun : *Orygynall Cronykil, Scot., III, ix, 100.*

² *Acts Parl. Scot., II, 7, § 3*, where heretics and Lollards are classed together.

³ Lindsay : *Hist. Reform., II, 276f.* See also Macewen, *Hist. Church Scot., I, 296, 331.*

⁴ *Exchequer Rolls of Scotland, Vols. I-XXIII (1264-1600)* issued by the Stationery Office.

A bitter persecution of his followers broke out in England on Wyclif's death. One after another of his prominent disciples recanted, and in 1401 William Sawtre was burned. Many sought refuge in Scotland, which till then had been little touched by heretical movements. Effective propaganda was done by these obscure and nameless Lollards as they came more into contact with the common people. It was then that Bohemia and Scotland were brought into touch with each other. A spirit of reform, which was concerned more with Christian practice than with Christian doctrine, was abroad in the Czech Church. It found a ready ally in the nationalism that was then rising in Bohemia, for both reform and nationalism, which had been fostered by the teaching of Wyclif, were united in the person of John Hus, an ardent follower of the English reformer. With the approval of Archbishop Sbynek, he had preached in the vernacular in the Bethlehem Chapel, Prague, from 1402 till 1408. So long as he confined himself to attacking abuses in a general way no outcry was raised against him, but as soon as he exposed and denounced the immoral lives of the clergy he was accused of heresy. In 1410, when religious and political excitement was rising, four letters, named *Nova Scocie*, which purported to have been written by a Scot named Quintin Folkhyrde or Folkhard¹ were taken from Scotland to Prague. Although the manuscript was available as early as 1793,² historians have either been ignorant of its existence or neglectful of it. The few brief references to the Letters fail to do justice to their contents, but they merit consideration, at least to the extent of testing their claim to be news from Scotland. If that claim is made good, we have in them documents of real importance in the history of Scottish Lollardy. A translation of portions of Epistle I and a summary of the others are here given.

II

In the Letters Folkhyrde, who is described as a squire [*quidam armiger*], and "a poor servant of God," tells how he rode through his native land, proclaiming in the language of the people what he sets forth in the Letters. Fear for his own eternal salvation constrained him, he declares, to stir up war against the enemies of God. His criticism of the clergy is characteristically Lollard in its tone and nature, and is set forth in Epistle I. After touching briefly on the duty of the common people and the lords temporal, he goes on to discuss and criticise the clergy who, with the two

¹ Miss Deanesly in *The Lollard Bible* (1920), p. 240, says:—" . . . the tracts of a Lollard Clement Folkhirde, were brought to Bohemia in 1410?" The reference is evidently to Quintin Folkhyrde, though the Christian name is given incorrectly.

² Communicated in a personal note by Prof. J. H. Baxter, D.D., St. Andrews.

former parties, constitute the three estates which compose the Church. He declares the clergy "ought completely to forsake the world and anxiety for it, and by study, intelligence, and preaching the truths of the Word of God to quicken the others, to administer without price and freely the sacraments of God, and to follow Christ closely in every respect. Because they fall away by doing what is contrary, and culpably neglect their duty, it seems that none of the three sections is more hostile to God than they : the Apostle says :—' He who has no concern for his own, and especially for those of his own household, denies the faith and is worse than an infidel.' Since the Apostle says this about any father [or mother] who ought to be concerned for his family, *a fortiori*, it holds true concerning the priests. They have the spiritual care of the house of God, and on this account receive tithes and offerings in place of pay for their toil. They, nevertheless, do no work, as [Pope] Gregory says, but live blameworthy lives in their pleasures and rob God's poor in not teaching them the law of God, the articles of faith, the Lord's Prayer, the commandments of God, and the gospel of Christ in the mother tongue ; in not distributing the goods of the Church, which remain over beyond their scanty need, for the relief of the poor, the blind, the lame, the infirm, the feeble, as well as widows and orphans : as Gregory says, ' Bad priests are a cause of a people's ruin.' And because all this iniquity, and much greater, is displayed senselessly, negligently and blindly, and is left practically uncorrected by those who are ordained by God for the purpose, viz., the chief priests themselves, and especially the lords temporal—kings and dukes, earls, barons, knights and squires—who for this reason carry the sword, as says the apostle, Therefore I, Quintin Folkhyrde, most poor servant of God, failing these temporal lords, and for the fear which I have of eternal damnation, which will befall me unless I do what is in me for the amending of these evils and for the remission of all my sins, openly stir up a holy war upon these enemies of God and all their allies, as far as God will deign to show me His favour, without which no good work can be begun, honestly pursued or perfectly accomplished. In the name, therefore, of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, Amen, if any one is for the Lord let him place his sword upon his thigh and join himself to me. This address Moses uttered when he made war in the cause of God as it is in Exodus xxxii."

As yet there is no thought of breaking with the Church, for the criticism is by a faithful son, whose concern for her well-being leads him to speak out. As was to be expected the criticism and challenge were not allowed to go unnoticed. The clergy in their indignation, Folkhyrde tells us in the preface to Epistle II, sought to stir up the temporal lords to punish him, while they themselves proceeded with ecclesiastical censures. But the bold critic was neither to be overawed nor silenced. He returned to

the charge and to his defence in a letter addressed to the Bishop of Glasgow¹ and his accomplices, as well as to all the clergy of Scotland.

The answer to Folkhyrde's charges was that they were mistaken and heretical. In Epistle II he asks his adversaries to disprove what he had alleged and he would promise to accept correction. If his charges are well founded he called upon them to amend their mode of life. That done, he promises to interfere no more. If they will not deign to answer, they will thereby show themselves to be haughty and foolish as well as obstinate and unwilling to be reformed. He repeats his determination to accept the full consequences of what he has said, because "they are exiles from God, His enemies, priests not in deed but only in name," and therefore to be treated as greedy wolves in sheep's clothing. He is prepared to die for the correction of abuses rather than continue to live under them.

In his third Epistle he summons the secular lords and the people, as they value their eternal well-being, to rally against all priests who step beyond the bounds of God's law and spend their lives in luxury and indulgence, as well as in other notorious abuses. To hold back is to be a partaker with them in their sins, and at the last to be sharers with them in their punishment.

In his fourth and last Epistle, Folkhyrde addresses himself to the curates. After recalling his various warnings, he exhorts them to amend their past errors, to give up all worldliness, to instruct their parishioners in their mother tongue [*in materna lingua*], to preach the Gospel and read the Epistle to those gathered in the church on the Lord's Day, and to dispense the sacraments freely. He asks them, as good stewards, to administer the tithes and offerings of the people, and to retain for themselves only a portion sufficient for the necessities of life, while devoting a second portion to pay what is exacted by the law of God, and a third to meet the needs of the poor. In thus admonishing them he claims to speak as their friend, but should they disregard his warning he threatens war more fierce than that waged on Jews or Saracens.

III

Can we accept the *Nova Scocie* as being what they profess to be, viz., letters from Scotland about 1410? At first sight it may seem strange that letters should be sent from Scotland, which until that time had shown no particular interest in Bohemia. Had they come from England,

¹ There seems to be uncertainty in the text of the letters here. Sedlák, whose text has been followed, reads "Glatonensi" giving in the margin as an alternative reading "Glasgoviensi." Professor Baxter in *Copiale Prioratus Sanctiandree*, p. 232, reads "Glacovensi." Considering that the letters profess to have come from Scotland, it seems to be an attempt to give a Latin form to the word Glasgow. So also Professor Workman, *John Wyclif* (1926), I, 10, following Dr Loserth.

one would not have been surprised because of the close connection between the two countries and their common interest in Wyclif's teaching. But the unexpectedness of the claim really tells in its favour, as there is no reason why letters should purport to come from Scotland unless they really did.

Can the writer of the Letters be identified?¹ There is one person of this name of whom something is known. The details, it is true, are very meagre, but they are so attested as to leave no room for doubt as to his existence. In the *Calendar of Patent Rolls* the following entries occur under date 1407² :—

Aug. 16. Nottingham Castle. Safe conduct, for one month, for Quintin Folkhard of Scotland, now within the realm, going to London on divers business and returning to the king's presence, and his horses and harness.

Sept. 11. Beverley. The like, until Christmas, for the same, going to Scotland, and returning to the realm with three servants, horse or foot, in his company and bringing certain animals of his into the realm for his necessary expenses.³

No further notice of safe-conducts in favour of Folkhyrde has been found. In the course of his travels he must have passed through districts strongly infected with Lollard teaching, and may even have met Bohemian sympathisers, who were then not uncommon in England. Dr R. L. Poole suggests that the *Nova Scocie* "were carried out to Prague in 1410, possibly by the hands of the same bearer as the two letters of 8th September of Wyche to Hus and of Oldcastle to Wok of Waldstein."⁴ If this suggestion is set aside for the moment, the undoubted facts regarding Folkhyrde not only strengthen the conclusion that the *Nova Scocie* came from Scotland, but supply a reasonable explanation for an otherwise unlikely event. It is evident that they could have been written only by one who had travelled in Scotland and in England when and where Folkhyrde travelled.

This is all that has been discovered of the history of Quintin Folkhyrde. Dr Workman calls him "an interesting Scots cattle-driver and evangelist."⁵ That he was something more than this seems evident, and the perusal of his letters fully supports the conjecture. On the other hand he does not disclose his rank or status. He is described as "armiger" only in the editorial notes and comments to the introductions to Epistles I and II, and in the post-script to Epistle IV. That he wrote in Latin and appealed

¹ See article by Dr Reginald L. Poole in the *Eng. Hist. Review*, I, 309-311.

² *Rotulus Viagii*—8 Henry IV, III, 1405-1408.

³ See also *Calendar of Documents Scot.*, IV, 144.

⁴ *Eng. Hist. Review*, VII, 309-311.

⁵ *John Wyclif* (1926), I, 10.

to the three sections of the church, making charges, which, though general, give evidence of being based on the wide, yet intimate, knowledge of the conditions prevailing at the time, proves him to have been a man of education and of some social standing. To the second and fourth Letters he affixes the seal of his office [*sigillum nostri officii fecimus hic apponi . . . in omnium istorum testimonium hiis literis sigillum nostri officii est appensum*]. It is not to be expected that a "common drover" would possess an official seal! But if so, what was the office, the seal of which is minutely described at the end of the second letter?—"Forma autem sigillii sui est circulus et in medio circuli scutum cum figura crucis cum tribus clavis cruci affixis; in vacuo autem circuli supra scutum forma corone spinee, scriptura vero circularis in circumferencia circuli est hec; ADIUVA, DOMINE DEUS OMNIPOTENS." If we think of his office as the rôle he felt himself called upon to take, viz., that of the reformer of the Church and guardian of her welfare, the symbols and motto of the seal become suggestive, and obviously self-chosen. He wrote as the protector of the truth of God: the shield encloses the cross. He was fully aware of the risk he ran, and the consequences he might have to face in torture and death, which is signified by the crown of thorns surmounting the shield: while the motto in the circumference—"Help Lord God Almighty"—was most appropriate on the lips of one embarking on an enterprise so hazardous. When it is remembered that in those days surnames were only beginning to come into general use, his name might well point in the same direction. It could be assumed by him in a way not possible to-day, as it suggested his former activities. He was God's "Flockherd," and one might be tempted to conclude he was a churchman if several very definite considerations did not turn the scale against that conclusion.

The title, "armiger," is in keeping with the internal evidence of the letters. In Epistle II he declares that the function of the lords temporal was "to be acquainted with the law of God and to defend it, to protect the servants of Christ and to crush the agents of Antichrist," and adds that: "this is the reason for their carrying the sword,"—a just description of the rôle he took upon himself. The appeal at the end is the appeal of a man raising a crusade. It is also to be noted that, in Epistle II, the clergy replied to his indictment by appealing first of all to the temporal lords that they might deal with an unruly member of their own order. Had Folkhyrde been a churchman he would have been tried by a Church court first of all, and then, if found guilty of heresy, handed over to the secular arm for punishment. In his appeal in Epistle II, he further says: "and so we, and all Christians, but especially the lords temporal, are compelled to treat you, not as good priests, but as ravening wolves in sheep's clothing," where he manifestly includes himself among the lords temporal.

All the indications of the letters—their point of view, their appeal, and his seal—therefore confirm the conclusion that Folkhyrde was one of the smaller barons or lairds, who came to be looked on later as the third and lowest class among landowners.¹

There is no information available, so far, as to which part of the country claimed this early squire-reformer. Could it possibly be Ayrshire, “that receptacle of Goddis servandis of old,” as Knox called Kyle?² It is an interesting possibility, by no means remote, to think that Folkhyrde may have been one among the nameless band who sowed the seed that came to harvest before the century closed. In his journeys to and from England he would almost certainly pass, at some point or other, through that southern district of Scotland which has played so great a part in the struggle for religious liberty.

Nothing more is known of him after 1410. One would like to know what fate awaited him, whether or not he was called upon to show the sincerity of his confession and the strength of his conviction by paying for the courage of his pen with his life. That his warning words were unheeded, history clearly shows: but it also proves that the leaven of Lollardy was working. The Church authorities in Scotland were alive to the presence of a grave danger in their midst and determined to check its progress. In 1416 it was required of Masters of Arts of St. Andrews to take an oath to resist all who adhered to the sect of the Lollards,³ and about the year 1420 some Wyclifite heretics were arrested in Scotland.⁴ Measures in increasing severity were therefore being taken against Lollards. Can Folkhyrde possibly have then met his fate at the hands of William Lauder, Bishop of Glasgow from 1408 till 1425, to whom with his clergy he addressed the provocative words of his second letter? One can only surmise, and regret that the “scrollis of Glasgw” have not been preserved. Perhaps, here is the unknown Glasgow martyr of 1422?⁵

IV

There is no evidence that the appeal of the *Nova Scocie* brought forth any immediate response from Bohemia. It was not till 1433 that the presence of a missionary from the Czechs, in the person of Paul Crawar, physician, propagandist, and martyr, is noted in Scotland. Why he came

¹ Cosmo Innes: *Scot. Legal Antiquities* (1872), p. 135.

² Knox: *Works* (Laing's Ed.), I, 105.

³ *Andrew Melville* (1856), p. 405. Dr M'Crie quotes this article from the University records.

⁴ *Raynaldi Annales Ecclesiastici*, VIII (Ed. 1752), 523, i.e., *Wicleffistae in Scotia*.

⁵ Prof. Mitchell: “Baird Lectures,” 1899, *Scot. Reformation*, p. 15, makes a similar suggestion.

is not known :¹ his coming may have been a belated response to the twenty-year-old appeal of Folkhyrde.

Particulars regarding him are very meagre. It is difficult to say to what nationality he belonged. Professor Bartos believes his birth-place to have been somewhere in Moravia, though his family was quite distinct from the Lords of Kravar (Crawar), a prominent noble family resident in Moravia at that time.² Professor Bednár also supports this view.³ Bower, who is our chief informant, calls him a Teuton.⁴ Possibly his being for a time at Thorn, a town now in Poland but then in Prussia, gave grounds for this conclusion. We know also he was for a period in the service of King Vladimir Jagiello of Poland,⁵ but it was from Prague he was sent when he came to Scotland. It seems, therefore, reasonable to conclude that he belonged to one of the Slavonic peoples.

He is found at St. Andrews in the summer of 1433.⁶ Professor Bednár holds he could hardly have got there before 1430,⁷ but it might be argued that even 1430 is too early. Perhaps the Czech historian is influenced by his belief that Crawar was able to speak to the people in Scots. This circumstance, if true, would explain the brass ball being put into his mouth, as Knox tells us was done, and as Prof. Bednár is disposed to believe.⁸ With Crawar's martyrdom three years after his arrival, it would have been possible for him to have acquired sufficient of the vernacular to speak to those who did not understand Latin. We know, however, that in January 1432 Crawar was at Thorn, for a letter, dated January 11 of that year [*feria VI infra octavas Epiphanie A.D. MCCCCXXXII*]⁹, sent by him to King Vladimir of Poland, is extant. The question therefore resolves itself into whether Crawar was in Scotland prior to 1432, i.e., in 1430, as Dr Bednár suggests, or did he pay only one visit which resulted

¹ Prof. Bednár : *Casopis Matice Moravské* (1915), p. 74.

² Communicated in a personal letter in 1931 by Prof. Bartos.

³ Bednár : *Op. cit.*, p. 72.

⁴ *Scotichronicon*, II, xvi, § xx, 495.

⁵ *Monumenta Medii Aevi Hist. Poloniae*, XIV (1894), pp. 513-4. The author is indebted to Prof. Bartos of the Hussite Seminary, Prague, for a transcription of this letter.

⁶ *Scotich* : *ibid.*, p. 495.

⁷ Bednár : *Op. cit.*, p. 74.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 75.

⁹ This is the same year as in our modern reckoning. Dr Odlozilík, formerly of the School of Slavonic Languages, London, now of Prague, writes in a personal communication : " In this country (Bohemia) and very likely also in Torun [the Polish name for Thorn] the New Year was beginning either on 25-xii, or i-i, but not on 25-iii." The writer is indebted to Dr Odlozilík for furnishing him with the references to Prof. Bednár's work.

in his death in July 1433? There is general agreement regarding the latter date: of the first possibility there is no clear evidence. All that can be said is that the visit which ended in Cawar's death, the only visit of which there is a record, must have taken place within eighteen months of his martyrdom.

It is not surprising, but only natural, that Cawar should find his way to St. Andrews. It was then the only university town in Scotland, and already many actual and potential sympathisers with Lollard teaching were to be found among its student population. His Lollard tenets, together with his academic training, warranted his believing that he would be welcomed. Bower seems to have been dubious regarding his standing as a doctor, for he speaks of him as recommended from the heretics of Prague *tanquam praececellens arte medicinae*, and Father Hunter Blair, in his version of Bellesheim's *History*, summarily disposes in rather partisan fashion of his profession of medicine as "nothing but a cloak to conceal his real occupation as a teacher of heresy."¹ It is on record, however, that Paul Cawar was admitted to the faculty of medicine in Prague in 1416 on his producing authentic letters, with the official seals appended, showing that he was an accredited Master of Arts of the University of Paris and likewise a Bachelor of Medicine of Montpellier.² Corroborative evidence is to be found in the letter to the King of Poland already referred to.³ From it we learn that Cawar had been the recipient of many favours and gifts, as well as a salary of sixteen marks a year, from King Vladimir, though he complains that for the past four years he had not received a penny because of false and wicked stories about him. He signs the letter as the king's doctor:—"Paulus Cawar, arcium Magister Parisiensis et Baccalarius in medicis, vestre serenitatis et regni vestri Polonie medicus indignus." His good standing as a physician is therefore established beyond question.

While the letter does not help with materials for a biography, it throws some light upon the character of the man. From the programme he outlines he is evidently an idealist of a marked type, a man conscious of divine leading [*est enim quidem spiritus cor meum movens et pulsans rationem a multis annis tam elapsis*], and obviously prepared to go any length for his beliefs. Bower describes him as the arch-heretic, despite the fact that he

¹ Bellesheim: *Hist. Catholic Ch. Scot.* (Ed. 1887), trans. by D. O. Hunter Blair, II, 56.

² *Mon. Univ. Prag.*, I, i, 439 n. The writer is indebted to Dr Odložilík for a copy of the extract.

³ This letter has evidently escaped the notice of writers on Scottish Church History, but is of interest and importance enough to deserve more than a passing reference. The only reference found to this letter is in the notes to Prof. Baxter's *Copiale Prioratus Sanctiandree*, p. 460.

came from the Praguites, the more moderate of the reforming parties of Bohemia. It is therefore very evident that Bower attaches great importance to him, quite out of proportion to the definitely known period of his activities in Scotland. He was clearly no chance visitor or solitary missionary. He may have come alone, though even of this there is no evidence. He certainly came as an apostle from the Hussites and Wyclifites of Bohemia¹ and to a country from which an appeal had already been made to Bohemia.

V

When we turn to examine the teaching of Crawar we find that it is detailed to a less extent than even that of Resby, another early Scottish martyr. In his letter to the King of Poland Crawar gives little clue to his beliefs, though he shows his facility in enforcing a point by apt scripture quotation. In connection with his complaint that false and malicious stories had been circulated regarding him, there is a reference to the presence of heresy in Bohemia. He protests his innocence, and declares that he had been labouring for the past ten years so that he might confer and treat with his highness on difficult, secret, and divine mysteries touching the standing and honour of the Kingdom of Poland and the neighbouring lands of Christendom. He claims that dangers might thereby have been avoided, and even heresies in Bohemia annulled, and as many heathen as possible and Jews converted to the Catholic Faith—*Et eciam hereses in Bohemia fuissent annullate et pagani quamplurimi et Iudei fuissent ad fidem catholicam conversi*. In line with this idea, and further on in the letter, he again expresses his desire that all nations, including even Jews, should be converted to the faith of Jesus Christ, and concludes with the hope that “the darkness of vice and error be driven far away, the wicked ground together and destroyed, and so the whole world will gladly rejoice to blossom with the flowers of the virtues of the Catholic Faith—*et sic totus mundus virtutum floribus Catholice fidei letabitur gaudenter germinare*. There is no suggestion of any break with the Catholic Church. In desiring reform Crawar is in the succession of Wyclif and Hus.

Passing to the specific charges brought against him when on trial for heresy, we find Knox, in his account, saying simply: “His accusation consisted principallye that he followed Johnne Husse and Wyckleif, in the opinion of the sacrament, who denyed that the substance of braid and wyn war changed be vertew of any wourdis; or that confessioun should be maid to preastis: or yitt prayeris to sanctes departed.”² Bishop

¹ *Scotich: Op. cit.*, p. 495.

² *Works* (Laing's ed.), I, 6.

Leslie, in his *History*, with equal brevity says that "Evin than the haereticks of Boheme, of the haeresie of Wicleffe, directed ane, Paul Crau, to Scotland, to spred throuch al the nuickes of Scotland Wickleffes doctrine."¹ He pictures Crawar stealthily coming into the country that "he may saw his venomous poyson."

Archbishop Spottiswood is almost as brief though somewhat more detailed: "Some twenty-four years afterwards [i.e. after Resby's death] Paul Craw, a Bohemian, came into Scotland, and for venting certain opinions touching the sacrament of the supper, the adoration of saints, and auricular confession, he was also condemned and burnt at St. Andrews in the year 1432."² In Bellesheim's *History* we read that "Bower has recorded the principal heads of the doctrine of Crawar and his adherents."³ But all that Bower says is "*Hic in sacris literis et in allegatione bibliae promptus et exercitatus erroneos pragenses et Wiklivienses pertinaciter tenebat*,"⁴ which is quite in harmony with what is found in his letter. Bower then tells of the sects into which the heretics of Bohemia were at that time divided—The Taborites, presided over by a certain priest, Procopius; the Orphanics, the head of which was one Peter Crek, *haeresiarcha*, a renegade Englishman who had turned Bohemian; and the Praguities, or Praguers as they were sometimes called, who were also known as the Calixtines because they claimed the cup [*calix*] for the laity.⁵ This last was evidently the sect to which Crawar belonged. Bower, while distinguishing them by name, slumps them together as heretics—"These insidious sects proclaimed perfection in words but belied it in deeds."

Passing on to describe their peculiarities in more detail, Bower tells how Procopius officiated, clad with a tunic reaching to his ankles, with long sleeves, like the brothers minor, and having something like a doctor's cap on his head. He celebrated mass after a style of his own, without sacred vestments. He dispensed with the Epistle and the Gospel, and all other things customary in it. He began with the Lord's Prayer, adding "The Lord Jesus after He had supped," and so on to the words of consecration of the body and blood inclusively. He summarises their beliefs thus: "They do not believe in Purgatory. They detest all religion. They abhor pilgrimages. They despise orders and Church authority. They deny the resurrection of the dead. . . . A sect of these Praguities was fortunately destroyed through the wisdom of the Council of Basel. These cared nothing for sacraments or holy orders, but

¹ Bishop Leslie: *Historie Scot.* (Scot. Text. Soc.), II, 40, 41.

² Spotswood: *Hist. Church Scot.*, ed. 1847, I, 112.

³ Bellesheim: *Op. cit.*, II, 56.

⁴ *Scotich: Op. cit.*, p. 495.

⁵ *Ibid.*

completely subverted them and the holy places of the religious."¹ They claimed for the secular power the right to judge and to punish the spiritual if need be. Other things they taught undermining the authority of the Church, and so pandered to the pride and self-importance of the secular lords. Thus craftily such "heretics and Lollards enter in sheep's clothing, but within are found to be more dangerous than wolves." Accordingly, as often as "heretical Lollardy," or "Lollard heresy," began to sprout in the kingdom, the inquisitors, by the help of the secular arm, strove to cut it down.²

The Church authorities were evidently greatly alarmed at the presence and spread of this heresy, and felt that it struck the death knell of the old system with which their own fate and fortunes were identified. They could believe nothing too bad or too extravagant about it, and labelled its adherents false prophets, the foxes of Samson, a brood of vipers, snakes in the way, horned snakes in the path, hypocrites, Sadducees, Stoics and Epicureans, Wyclifites, Hussites, Procopiani, Praguites, disciples of the Archdragon, and more to like effect.³ It was as an ambassador from these that Crawar had come to Scotland.

There is also an article of Hussite propaganda—*Sermones de Antichrista or Anatomia Antichristi*, written in 1420 and printed in Hus' and Jerome's *Monumenta*, I, 1556 (2nd ed. 1715), which is thought likely to have been the work of Crawar, certainly of a doctor like Crawar, but Professor Bartos, while holding that it could very well be the work of Crawar, says, "It is meantime impossible to prove his authorship since the writing is on purpose anonymous and the ms. quite lost or unknown."⁴

But even apart from this, Crawar was a portent. He was a dangerous man to turn adrift in a country where Lollard opinions were so strong and widely spread that it was thought necessary to pass an act enjoining all bishops to search out all suspected of Lollard leanings and have them punished in accordance with the law of Holy Kirk, calling in, if need be, the help of the secular arm.⁵ This disciple of Wyclif must be silenced, and that speedily. On Laurence of Lindores, as inquisitor of heretical pravity, again devolved this responsibility. He was soon on his track, and fully justified Bower's description of him as one *qui nusquam infra regnum requiem dedit haereticis vel Lolardis*.⁵ He quickly had him arrested, convicted, condemned and sent to the stake.

¹ *Scotich: Op. cit.*, p. 495.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 496-7.

³ Communicated in a personal letter by Prof. Bartos.

⁴ *Acts. Parl. Scot.*, 1424/5, II, 7, § 3.

⁵ *Scotich: Op. cit.*, p. 495.

No further trace of missionaries of reform, continuing the part played by Crawar, has been found, nor was there anything distinctive enough in Bohemia's contribution to allow it to persist as a distinguishable strain in the Scottish reform movement. The emphatic claim of the Praguites for communion in both kinds found a place in the Reformation everywhere, but there is little doubt that the influence of Bohemia did augment the influence of Wyclif and therefore deserves to be recognised as an auxiliary, but by no means negligible, factor towards the Reformation movement in Scotland.